

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 136929
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ACDA-07 DODE-00 PM-04 SP-02 CIAE-00
INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 TRSE-00
CU-02 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /055 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS
APPROVED BY EUR:RDVINE
ACDA/ISP/REG:RSTRAND(DRAFT)
OSD/ISA:TPHDUNLOP
PM/DCA:PSCHOETTLE(INFO)
S/P:PSKAPLAN
EUR/RPM:JCKORNBLUM
-----140042Z 055836 /64

O R 132343Z JUN 77
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
AMEMBASSY BELGRADE
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 136929

HOLD FOR OPENING OF BUSINESS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING

REF: (A) NATO 4985; (B) NATO 4565; (C) STATE 75283;
(D) STATE 130422

1. EUR/IG WORKING GROUP ON CSCE/CBMS HELD MEETING JUNE 10
ON MOVEMENTS AND OTHER CBM QUESTIONS. GROUP EXAMINED
US POSITION ON MOVEMENTS IN LIGHT OF THE FOLLOWING:

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 136929

A. IT IS INCREASINGLY CLEAR THAT ONE OR SEVERAL CBM
MOVEMENTS INITIATIVES WILL BE TABLED BY THE NNAs.

B. MANY ALLIES HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY WISH TO ADVANCE OR
SUPPORT A MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE.

C. IT WOULD BE TO ALLIED ADVANTAGE TO SEEK TO RESPOND

POSITIVELY TO AN NNA INITIATIVE AS IT COULD CAUSE THE
NNAS TO ASSIST ALLIES ELSEWHERE IN THE CSCE FORUM.

D. WE EXAMINED POSSIBILITY OF A MOVEMENTS CBM IN TERMS
OF:

1) ALLIED POLICY TO KEEP THE PRIMARY FOCUS OF BELGRADE

ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION;

2) THE NEED TO MAINTAIN BALANCE AMONG CSCE SUBJECT
AREAS IN ADVANCING OR SUPPORTING INITIATIVES.

E. US DELAY IN STATING A MOVEMENTS POSITION WILL SOON
MAKE QUESTIONABLE US ARGUMENT THAT ALLIES NEED TO ORDER
CBM PRIORITIES AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE (PARAGRAPH ONE OF
REFTEL C).

F. MISSION HAS NOW INDICATED NECESSITY TO INFORM
ALLIES OF US THINKING ON MOVEMENTS TO ADVANCE WORK
ON PRIORITIES (SUMMARY PARAGRAPH C OF REFTEL A).

G. A MAJOR ALLY, THE FRG--AND ONE WHICH HAS A
SIGNIFICANT INTEREST IN A MOVEMENTS CBM--HAS NOW REACHED
A POSITION THAT ALLIES SHOULD SUPPORT A MOVEMENTS
INITIATIVE WHICH NNAS ARE EXPECTED TO MAKE BUT NOT TAKE
ANY INITIATIVE OF THEIR OWN (PARAGRAPH TEN OF REFTEL A
AND REFTEL B). OTHER ALLIES FAVOR A NATO INITIATIVE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 136929

H. MILITARY COMMITTEE HAS TO DATE CONCLUDED ONLY THAT
NOTIFICATION OF GROUND MOVEMENTS CONNECTED WITH A MAJOR
GROUND MANEUVER IS SUPPORTABLE (PARAGRAPH 23 OF SECOND
REVISED DRAFT OF ISD/141; USNATO 1735).

2. AFTER DISCUSSION OF THE ABOVE, WORKING GROUP
REACHED AGREEMENT ON THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT WHICH
THE MISSION MAY MAKE AT THE JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING:

A. "AFTER DISCUSSION OF SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES, WE HAVE
CONCLUDED THAT WE COULD, AT THIS TIME, SUPPORT IN
PRINCIPLE AN INITIATIVE BY THE NNAS TO STRENGTHEN
THE FINAL ACT PROVISION FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR
MILITARY MOVEMENTS IF ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS FOR SUCH
A PROPOSAL CAN BE DETERMINED AND AGREED UPON. IF
NNAS SHOULD OFFER ACCEPTABLY FORMULATED INITIATIVE, WE
BELIEVE NATO SHOULD SUPPORT IT. IF INITIAL NNA
PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE OR INADEQUATE, WE BELIEVE
NATO SHOULD SUGGEST TO NNAS ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION

WHICH IT COULD SUPPORT. ALTHOUGH WE SEE NO ADVANTAGE IN ALLIANCE ADVOCACY OF A MOVEMENTS CBM, WE RESERVE OUR POSITION ON QUESTION WHETHER UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER INITIATIVE ON MOVEMENTS THEMSELVES, AS SOME ALLIES PROPOSE. WE ARE CONTINUING OUR EFFORTS TO DEFINE THE PARAMETERS WITHIN WHICH A RESPONSE TO THE NNAS COULD BE MADE WHICH WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE US GOVERNMENT.

B. 'WE FURTHER BELIEVE INFORMING THE NNAS IN APPROPRIATE FASHION IN ADVANCE 1) OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT AN NNA MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE AND 2) OF THE ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS, ONCE ALLIED AGREEMENT HAS BEEN REACHED ON THEM, COULD ENCOURAGE THE NNAS TO ADVANCE CONSTRUCTIVE INITIATIVES.

C. "WE WILL CONSULT WITH THE ALLIES AS SOON AS
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 136929

WORK HAS BEEN COMPLETED ON A PARAMETERS DRAFT SINCE THEIR COMMENTS WOULD BE MOST HELPFUL IN CONCLUDING THE FINAL US POSITION."

3. MISSION SHOULD NOT DEVELOP THE STATEMENT FURTHER, IF QUESTIONS ARE ASKED, BUT MAY USE WHATEVER SECTIONS OF THE BACKGROUND IN PARAGRAPH ONE ABOVE IT FEELS WOULD BE APPROPRIATE IN PROVIDING SOME FURTHER CLARIFICATION.

FYI: WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REWORKING THE FIRST DRAFT OF A PAPER ON MAJOR MOVEMENTS. WE WOULD HOPE TO FORWARD IT TO THE MISSION FOR ALLIED (INCLUDING MILITARY COMMITTEE) COMMENTS WHICH WE WOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT IN DEVELOPING OUR FINAL POSITION. END FYI.

4. CONCERNING PARAGRAPH 2 OF REFTEL A, WE OF COURSE AGREE WITH ALLIES THAT WE SHOULD NOT BECOME INVOLVED IN A DEBATE WITH THE EAST ON NUMBERS OF MANEUVERS. WE BELIEVE, HOWEVER, IT WOULD BE FOOLISH TO ARRIVE AT BELGRADE WITHOUT SOME FACTS AND FIGURES AVAILABLE TO RESPOND TO ANY SOVIET GRANDSTANDING WITH NNAS AND MEDIA ON MANEUVERS LIMITATIONS AND OTHER SUBJECTS.

ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD AT LEAST BE IN A POSITION TO MAKE AVAILABLE TO THE NNAS OR MEDIA, IF REQUIRED, A SET OF IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE FIGURES WHICH COULD BELIE SOVIET CHARGES. MISSION SHOULD THEREFORE AGAIN SEEK TO HAVE INCLUDED IN THE REVISED ISD/141 A REQUEST TO SACEUR FOR DATA ALONG THE LINES OF PARAGRAPH 2B OF REFTEL D.

5. IF APPROPRIATE, MISSION MAY NOTE THAT THREE POSSIBLE INITIATIVES LISTED BY THE FRG, I.E., 10-15,000

TROOP NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD, IMPROVEMENT OBSERVER
TREATMENT AND MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE IN THE TOP SECTION
OF ANY ALLIED PRIORITY LIST OF INITIATIVES TO ADVANCE
AND SUPPORT. FYI: WE HOPE SHORTLY TO BE ABLE TO
PREPARE OUR OWN TENTATIVE PRIORITY LIST AS A RESULT
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 136929

OF THE INTERIM MOVEMENTS POSITION ABOVE. END FYI.

6. MISSION SUGGESTION FOR A DEMARCHE IN RELUCTANT
ALLIED CAPITALS ON SETTING CBM STRENGTHENING INITIATIVES
PRIORITIES (PARAGRAPH EIGHT OF REFTEL A) IS SOUND.
WE PLAN TO MAKE SUCH AN APPROACH ON CBM PRIORITIES (AND

POSSIBLY ON OTHER BASKET PRIORITIES AS WELL) AFTER
RECEIPT OF POLADS REACTION TO OUR INTERIM MOVEMENTS
POSITION AND OTHER INITIATIVES.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, POLICIES, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, MISSILES, MILITARY CAPABILITIES, MILITARY PLANS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 13-Jun-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE136929
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: PBSWIERS
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770211-0166
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770662/aaaacbzbv.tel
Line Count: 193
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: a4b7c97d-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 77 NATO BRUSSELS 4985, 77 NATO BRUSSELS 4565, 77 STATE 75283, 77 STATE 130422
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2170610
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING
TAGS: MPOL, US, CSCE, NATO
To: NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
vdkgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/a4b7c97d-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009